

EPA Official Record

Notes ID: B6E49BF7A1FDB5AF8825757C0060C413

From: Ben Cope/R10/USEPA/US

To: "Moore, David (ECY)" <DMOO461@ECY.WA.GOV>

Copy To: JROS461@ECY.WA.GOV; Brian Nickel/R10/USEPA/US@EPA; Laurie Mann/R10/USEPA/US

Delivered Date: 03/17/2009 10:54 AM PDT

Subject: March

Great turnaround...the emails are flying now...

Regarding the start date for limits, I would respectfully suggest that Ecology, as a conservative assumption based on EPA's findings in Idaho, move to a March 1 start date for limits. This issue is one that may fit in with the request for involvement by stakeholder modelers (aka the "pit crew" they want to be in my Nascar analogy). They could tackle it during the public process (if their clients want to pay for that analysis), and come back with info supporting a move back to April.

I'm concerned about burning an agency scenario on testing the impact of March only discharges. We have bigger fish to fry, and again I want to keep scenarios in reserve.

If you want to stick with April, you've got to tell me what I put into the model for expected March discharges from WA. This would be the expected quality of BMP operations. Confronting that new, complicated question is one reason I'm making the suggestion I'm making.

FYI, after a back and forth with PSU, I have instructed them to move the model start date for both ID and WA to Jan. 1, so the project won't be constrained in investigating this issue anymore. It's a day or two of work for them.

-BC

Ben Cope, Environmental Engineer
Office of Environmental Assessment
EPA Region 10
Seattle, Washington
206-553-1442

▼ "Moore, David (ECY)" <DMOO461@ECY.WA.GOV>

"Moore, David (ECY)" <DMOO461@ECY.WA.GOV> 03/17/2009 10:28 AM		
	To	Ben Cope/R10/USEPA/US@EPA
	cc	
	Subject	RE: Review: Technical Specifications for Scenarios

To echo what I just sent Laurie, I understood we were going with 30% reductions for Hangman and Coulee from April to May and the rest was unchanged. We are also proposing 50 for IEP in best treatment (unchanged from #1) and 35 for Kaiser (I think you have this right in this table but it says 10 in the step-by-step).

Thanks,
Dave

-----Original Message-----

From: Cope.Ben@epamail.epa.gov [mailto:Cope.Ben@epamail.epa.gov]
Sent: Tuesday, March 17, 2009 9:56 AM
To: Arnold, Gary (ECY); Robert.Steed@deq.idaho.gov; Ross, James D. (ECY); Moore, David (ECY); butler@spokanetribe.com; Mann.Laurie@epamail.epa.gov; John.Tindall@deq.idaho.gov; Nickel.Brian@epamail.epa.gov
Cc: Croxton.David@epamail.epa.gov
Subject: Review: Technical Specifications for Scenarios

All -

Here's the updated tech specifications, adopting Laurie's names for scenarios. Each tab is a scenario. I put 35 ppb TP for scenario #2...that's the low end of the range Brian reported in his phosphorus treatability memo. Just a placeholder until Ecology makes its tentative call on "the numbers" for that scenario.

Next up: tech specifications for model output, hopefully before our call this afternoon.

-BC

(See attached file: Technical Specifications for Scenarios 03-17-09.xls)

Ben Cope, Environmental Engineer
Office of Environmental Assessment
EPA Region 10
Seattle, Washington
206-553-1442